

not been responsive to these changes. The Balancing Act brings public policy out of the Ozzie and Harriet era and into line with the realities and pressures of modern life.

Specifically, the Balancing Act will provide paid family leave after the birth or adoption of a baby or young child; make major investments in child care, training and benefits for providers, construction and renovation of facilities, and expanded child care for infants and disabled children.

It will establish voluntary, universal preschool. It will expand the school breakfast program and provide dinners for children in afterschool programs whose parents are working late and make part-time employees eligible for job benefits while encouraging businesses to let more employees telecommute.

The Bush administration could not be more hostile to families trying to perform the balancing act. Their tax cuts benefit wealthy Americans, whose lives are already balanced. They think we can afford to rebuild the Iraqi society, but we have to cut vocational education and family literacy right here at home. They even think we can afford a manned mission to Mars, but for life back here on earth, we have to lop \$408 million from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

The administration does, however, want to help the poor acquire interpersonal skills so that they can promote and strengthen marriage, at a mere cost of \$1.5 billion. But, Mr. Speaker, the people I talk to do not want the government to be their family therapist. They want a government that helps create good jobs, flexible workplaces, universal health insurance, affordable child care and safe after-school programs.

No amount of counseling, Mr. Speaker, would have saved my marriage to a man who left me alone and destitute with three young children to raise. I was 29 years old. What I needed at that desperate moment in my life was not right wing moralizing but a compassionate safety net, the very social safety net conservatives seem determined to tear down. Although I had a job, I needed public assistance to provide my family with food, health insurance and child care. Only truly compassionate government policies helped me turn my life around.

If one is a Republican, however, pro-family means that heterosexual marriage is so indispensable that we must spend \$1.5 billion to promote it, but gay and lesbian marriage is so devalued that we ought to consider writing discrimination into our Constitution to prevent it.

The Balancing Act offers a real pro-family agenda for all families. It addresses the issues families struggle with at the kitchen table, not the things they do in their bedrooms.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting my legislation.

□ 2030

#### OUTSOURCING AMERICAN JOBS IS BAD FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEAUPREZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when President Bush campaigned for his election in 2000, he was very persuasive, and he is a very persuasive President, and he persuaded the American people that he was a compassionate conservative and most of us thought he would be. Then he used his persuasion techniques to convince the American people that Saddam Hussein, a bum dictator in the Middle East who was busy writing novels, not worried about weapons of mass destruction, was an imminent threat to the United States of America.

But today, Mr. Speaker, the President is trying to use his persuasion techniques on an issue that will be very difficult. President Bush is now saying that outsourcing United States jobs is good for the United States of America. This takes the cake. Many of these articles have been cited here tonight: L.A. Times, "Bush Supports Shift in Jobs Overseas"; Seattle Times, "Sending Jobs Overseas Helps the United States"; Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, 1 hour from my district in Youngstown, Ohio, "Bush Economic Report Praises Outsourcing Jobs"; Orlando Sentinel, "Bush Says Sending Jobs Abroad Can Be Beneficial."

Mr. Speaker, give me a break. This President said in his State of the Union address, "Much of our job growth will be found in high-skilled fields like health care." President Bush's economic adviser said, "We will outsource jobs to lower-wage countries as a way to help control the upward spiral of health care costs in the United States of America."

How can we believe for one second that losing United States jobs, losing high-wage, high-paying manufacturing jobs, medical jobs, science jobs in the United States of America is somehow good for this country?

Mr. Speaker, I ask the President to please be straight with the American people. In Ohio, we have an unemployment rate of almost 6 percent; 264,000 jobs have been lost in the State of Ohio. On Labor Day, the President came to Ohio. He passed up Youngstown and he passed up Toledo and he passed up Steubenville and Akron, and he passed up Lima, and he went to Richfield, one of the wealthiest suburbs in Ohio for Labor Day. He passed up all of the cities that have seen manufacturing erode and all of the manufacturing jobs shipped overseas, and now he is trying to convince us that losing all of these jobs is good.

Mr. President, look in the eyes, as I have to do every weekend when I go home, and as many Members of Congress have to do when they go home, look in the eyes of these workers and

tell them that their losing their job is somehow good for the United States, them losing their job is somehow patriotic.

When we talked about all of these free trade agreements, and I remember hearing it during NAFTA and the debates during the 1990s, and now the President wants to pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement all the way down to South America, the promise always was that we were going to invest money into education, we were going to invest into the American people. As we have to compete globally, we have to invest. And now we have a President who has done nothing on Pell grants, nothing on No Child Left Behind, underfunded by billions of dollars, putting more regulations on our young people and our teachers, school boards and superintendents, not making the proper investment. Mr. President, be straight with the American people.

We cannot believe, and we will not believe, and I look forward to the President and this administration trying to convince the American people that losing jobs in the United States of America is good. This is going to be a great election year where we have one candidate saying that outsourcing of United States jobs is a good thing, and another candidate that is saying outsourcing of American jobs is a bad thing.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to make a big claim here tonight. I am going to say that I believe the American people will side with the candidate that says keeping jobs here in the United States is what is best for America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STRICKLAND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTIERREZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### HISPANICS ARE LOSING UNDER RECENT POLICIES ANNOUNCED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight very concerned with the state of America under the Bush Administration. On the issues of immigration, education and the budget, this President has failed to live up to his promises. Too many Americans have been left out of the prosperity that this President pledged to them, and his only reaction to past